

## Brigham Young University Law School BYU Law Digital Commons

---

### Utah Court of Appeals Briefs

---

1987

# Salt Lake City v. Roger Griffin : Brief of Respondent

Utah Court of Appeals

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/byu\\_ca1](https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/byu_ca1)

Original Brief Submitted to the Utah Court of Appeals; digitized by the Howard W. Hunter Law Library, J. Reuben Clark Law School, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah; machine-generated OCR, may contain errors.

Bruce R. Baird; Assistant City Attorney; Attorney for Respondent.

Robert Macri; Attorney for Appellant.

---

### Recommended Citation

Brief of Respondent, *Salt Lake City v. Griffin*, No. 870194 (Utah Court of Appeals, 1987).

[https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/byu\\_ca1/440](https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/byu_ca1/440)

This Brief of Respondent is brought to you for free and open access by BYU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Utah Court of Appeals Briefs by an authorized administrator of BYU Law Digital Commons. Policies regarding these Utah briefs are available at

[http://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/utah\\_court\\_briefs/policies.html](http://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/utah_court_briefs/policies.html). Please contact the Repository Manager at [hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu](mailto:hunterlawlibrary@byu.edu) with questions or feedback.

1949

 $\sqrt{T}$ 

KFU

50

A10

DOCKET NO.

870194

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

)

1

3

)

)

BRIEF OF RESPONDENT

No. 870194-CA

Priority Classification 2

Appeal from a Conviction for Destruction of  
Property, Creating a Disturbance and Disturbing  
the Peace in the Fifth Circuit Court for Salt Lake City  
Robert Gibson, Judge

BRUCE R. BAIRD  
Assistant City Attorney  
324 South State, Suite 510  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111  
Telephone: (801) 535-7788

Attorney for Respondent on Appeal

ROBERT MACRI  
738 South 600 East  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84102  
Telephone: (801) 364-3018

Attorney for Appellant

RECEIVED  
NOV 24 1987  
870194-CA  
COURT OF APPEALS

OPINION ACTION SLIP

CASE NAME: Salt Lake City v. Roger Griffin

CASE NUMBER: 870194-CA

TYPE OPINION: MAJ: X CONC      DISS      DATE OF  
HEARING: Law and Motion  
OPINION AUTHOR: Per Cur./KST DATE OF  
PANEL MEMBERS: Garff/Jackson/ OPINION:                       
Orme DATE OF  
ACTION:                     

INTENDED ACTION OF JUDGE                     

- Concur
- Concur conditional upon changes
- Concur with suggested changes
- Concur with opinion
- Concur in result without opinion
- Concur in result with opinion
- Concur in part, Dissent in part
- Dissent with opinion
- Dissent without opinion
- Join in the concurring opinion of Judge
- Join in the dissenting opinion of Judge
- Stay with the majority opinion
- Release opinion (Author only)
- Do not release opinion (Author or PJ only)

DIRECTIONS

- a. Record your name in the space provided.
- b. Mark the space that describes your action with respect to this opinion.
- c. Send the action slip to the clerk of the court.
- d. The clerk will record the action and forward the slip to the author of the opinion.
- e. Maintain a personal record of this action as you see a need.

DEADLINES

- a. To file action slip: 7 days from receipt
- b. Majority opinion first draft: 45 days from argument.
- c. Majority opinion final draft filed with clerk:  
90 days from argument.
- d. Concurring or dissenting opinion first draft:  
20 days from initial circulation of majority opinion.
- e. Concurring or dissenting opinion final draft filed with clerk:  
20 days from final majority opinion.
- f. To object to the release of an opinion:  
7 days. Make objection known to author or PJ.

JAN 29 1988

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

-----oo0oo-----

Salt Lake City,	}	
	}	
Plaintiff and Respondent,	}	
	}	
v.	}	MEMORANDUM DECISION
	}	(For Publication)
	}	
Roger Griffin,	}	Case No. 870194-CA
	}	
Defendant and Appellant.	}	

Before Judges Garff, Jackson and Orme (On Law and Motion).

-----

The notice of appeal in the above-captioned case was filed with this court on May 22, 1987. A docketing statement was filed on June 16, 1987 stating that the appeal was from "a final Order of Conviction of the Circuit Court" and that the date of the "Judgment or Order sought to be reviewed is the date of conviction, to-wit: March 23, 1987 by a city jury. On June 19, 1987, this court rejected appellant's docketing statement, which did not attach a copy of the judgment or order being appealed. Appellant by way of an Amendment to Docketing Statement provided a copy of the computer docket sheet from the Fifth Circuit Court "demonstrating that the sentencing in this matter took place on 4/21/87." The appeal proceeded to briefing.

This court now has the entire record of proceedings in the Fifth Circuit Court before it. A review of the record reveals

no judgment or sentencing order signed by the trial court supporting the computerized docket entry provided by appellant. Because no signed judgment or order appears in the record, we are without jurisdiction to consider the merits of the appeal due to the absence of a final judgment. See Sather v. Gross, 727 P.2d 212 (Utah 1986); Utah State Tax Commission v. Ereksen, 714 P.2d 1151 (Utah 1986).

The appeal is dismissed on the basis that this Court lacks jurisdiction to consider the merits of the appeal. R. Utah Ct. App. 10(e). No costs are awarded.

DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of January, 1988.

FOR THE COURT:

---

Regnal W. Garff, Judge

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

SALT LAKE CITY,	)	
	)	BRIEF OF RESPONDENT
Plaintiff and Respondent,	)	
	)	No. 870194-CA
vs.	)	Priority Classification 2
	)	
ROGER GRIFFIN,	)	
	)	
Defendant and Appellant.	)	

---

Appeal from a Conviction for Destruction of  
Property, Creating a Disturbance and Disturbing  
the Peace in the Fifth Circuit Court for Salt Lake City  
Robert Gibson, Judge

---

BRUCE R. BAIRD  
Assistant City Attorney  
324 South State, Suite 510  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111  
Telephone: (801) 535-7788

Attorney for Respondent on Appeal

ROBERT MACRI  
738 South 600 East  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84102  
Telephone: (801) 364-3018

Attorney for Appellant

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	ii
STATEMENT OF THE NATURE OF THE PROCEEDINGS AND APPELLATE AUTHORITY.....	1
ISSUES PRESENTED.....	1
GOVERNING LAW.....	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	2
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	2
ARGUMENT.....	3
POINT I	
DEFENDANT GRIFFIN FAILED TO MEET THE BURDEN REQUIRED TO DEMONSTRATE THAT HIS TRIAL WAS AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION OF THE SIXTH AMENDMENT.....	3
POINT II	
DEFENDANT'S COUNSEL VIOLATED RULE 11 IN FILING A BRIEF WHICH HAS ABSOLUTELY NO GOOD FAITH CHANCE OF PREVAILING.....	6
CONCLUSION.....	7

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>Anders v. California</u> , 386 U.S. 738, 18 L.Ed.2d 493, 87 S.Ct. 1396 (1967).....	6
<u>Duren v. Missouri</u> , 439 U.S. 357, 58 L.Ed.2d 579, 99 S.Ct. 664 (1979).....	4, 5, 6
<u>First Federal Savings &amp; Loan Ass'n of Salt Lake City v. Schamanek</u> , 684 P.2d 1257 (Utah 1984).....	2
<u>State v. Bankhead</u> , 727 P.2d 216 (Utah 1986).....	5, 6
<u>State v. Clayton</u> , 639 P.2d 168 (Utah 1981).....	6
<u>State v. Malin</u> , Utah Supreme Court No. 87-0571 (Minute Entry April 30, 1987).....	5
<u>Taylor v. Louisiana</u> , 419 U.S. 522, 42 L.Ed.2d 690, 95 S.Ct. 692 (1975).....	3, 5, 6
<u>Utah Rules of Civil Procedure</u> , Rule 11.....	1



STATEMENT OF THE NATURE OF THE PROCEEDINGS  
AND APPELLATE AUTHORITY

This is an appeal from a criminal conviction after a jury trial in the Fifth Circuit Court for Salt Lake City, the Honorable Robert Gibson, Judge, presiding, on the charges of destruction of property and disturbing the peace. Authority for this appeal is provided in Section 78-2a-3, Utah Code Annotated.

ISSUES PRESENTED

1. Whether defendant Griffin established that his Sixth Amendment constitutional right to a jury trial was violated by lack of minorities on the jury venire?

2. Whether counsel for defendant/appellant Griffin violated Rule 11, of the Utah Rules of Civil Procedure by filing a brief not well grounded in fact and directly contrary to existing law?

GOVERNING CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND RULES

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, AMENDMENT SIX

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed . . . ."

RULE 11, U.R.C.P.

. . . The signature of an attorney or party constitutes a certificate by him that he has read the pleading, motion, or other paper; that to the best of his knowledge, information and belief formed after reasonable inquiry it is well grounded in fact and is warranted by existing law or a good faith argument for the extension,

modification, or reversal of existing law, and that it is not interposed for any improper purpose, such to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the cost of litigation.

#### STATEMENT OF THE CASE<sup>1</sup>

Defendant Griffin was charged by information with violating Section 32-3-4, Revised Ordinances of Salt Lake City, for unlawfully destroying property of Salt Lake City Corporation by damaging doors at the City's Water Department. (Record on Appeal p. 1.)

Prior to swearing a jury the defendant's counsel raised an objection to exclusion of minorities from the venire which was overruled.<sup>2</sup> (Calendar-log sheet, R. 40.)

At the conclusion of trial the jury returned a verdict of guilty on the destruction of property charge and on a charge of disturbing the peace in violation of Section 32-1-11, Revised Ordinances of Salt Lake City. (R. 34 & 35.)

#### SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The United States Supreme Court and the Supreme Court of Utah have both unequivocally and recently held that the

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendant Griffin's brief fails to comply with Rule 24 of the Rules of the Utah Court of Appeals by not citing at all to the record.

<sup>2</sup> Of course since defendant Griffin did not designate a copy of the transcript it is impossible to tell from the record whether or not the jury contained any minority members at all. Matters outside the record should not be considered on appeal. First Federal Savings & Loan Ass'n of Salt Lake City v. Schamanek, 684 P.2d 1257 (Utah 1984).

constitutional rights of defendants are not violated merely by the lack of any minority members on a jury venire. Rather, both the United States Supreme Court and the Utah Supreme Court have required proof of invidious exclusion before any constitutional challenge can be raised.

The case law is so unequivocal that defendant's brief constitutes a violation of Rule 11 in that it could not have been filed in good faith.

#### ARGUMENT

##### POINT I

DEFENDANT GRIFFIN FAILED TO MEET THE  
BURDEN REQUIRED TO DEMONSTRATE THAT HIS  
TRIAL WAS AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION  
OF THE SIXTH AMENDMENT.

The United States Supreme Court has twice set out the standard for determining whether a particular group's absence on a jury venire denies a criminal defendant his Sixth Amendment rights. In Taylor v. Louisiana, 419 U.S. 522, 538, 42 L.Ed.2d 690, 95 S.Ct. 692 (1975) the United States Supreme Court held that:

[P]etit juries must be drawn from a source fairly representative of the community . . .  
[J]ury wheels, pools of names, panels, or venires from which juries are drawn must not systematically exclude distinctive groups in the community and thereby fail to be reasonably representative thereof.

The Court in Taylor further explained that this requirement of a fair pool does not mean "that petit juries actually chosen must mirror the community," Taylor, supra at 538.

In Duren v. Missouri, 439 U.S. 357, 364, 58 L.Ed.2d 579, 99 S.Ct. 664 (1979) the United States Supreme Court explicitly set out a three part test to determine whether or not a particular venire selection process violated the defendant's constitutional rights:

In order to establish a prima facie violation of the fair-cross-section requirement, the defendant must show (1) that the group alleged to be excluded is a "distinctive" group in the community; (2) that the representation of this group in venires from which juries are selected is not fair and reasonable in relation to the number of such persons in the community; and (3) that this underrepresentation is due to systematic exclusion of the group in the jury selection process.

With respect to the three-prong Duren test it is clear that defendant Griffin has totally failed to meet his burden in this case. With respect to the first two prongs of a distinctive group's underrepresentation there is simply no evidence before this Court to establish that the two tests have been met. With respect to the third prong regarding exclusion, there is not even a claim in defendant Griffin's brief that minorities were systematically excluded.

Instead, defendant Griffin relies on a totally unsubstantiated allegation implying that since no minorities were on the panel they must have been excluded. While this enthymeme may make logical sense to defendant's counsel it certainly does not meet the Duren requirement and is totally unsupported by the virtually non-existent record before this Court.

The Duren and Taylor tests have been explicitly accepted by the Utah Supreme Court. In State v. Bankhead, 727 P.2d 216, 217 (Utah 1986) the Utah Supreme Court held:

In any event, the sixth amendment insures only that a particular segment of the community will not be systematically excluded from the jury venire. Juries actually chosen need not "mirror the community and reflect the various distinctive groups in the population." (Emphasis added, citations omitted).

The clear language of Bankhead, Duren and Taylor is not weakened in any way by the recent Utah Supreme Court Minute Entry in State v. Malin, Utah Supreme Court No. 86-0571 (Minute Entry April 30, 1987). All that the minute entry in Malin does is to use the Court's rule-making power to provide for a new, additional source of names for jury venires. There is no suggestion in the Malin Minute Entry that the Supreme Court intended to rule that all panels not chosen from a driver's license list or which fail to contain a minority, violate the Sixth Amendment. Such a suggestion is patently absurd. The Minute Entry is simply a prospective change with no intended or actual retroactive due process implication.

Given the absolute total lack of record before this Court and the "quality" of the argument in defendant Griffin's brief it is impossible for this Court to find that defendant Griffin's trial in any way violated his constitutional rights.

## POINT II

DEFENDANT'S COUNSEL VIOLATED RULE 11 IN  
FILING A BRIEF WHICH HAS ABSOLUTELY NO  
GOOD FAITH CHANCE OF PREVAILING.

Both the United States Supreme Court and the Supreme Court of the State of Utah have ruled on the responsibility of criminal defense counsel for filing appellate briefs in cases where they know the appeal is "wholly frivolous". The standard procedure is set out in Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738, 18 L.Ed.2d 493, 87 S.Ct. 1396 (1967) which was adopted by the Utah Supreme Court in State v. Clayton, 639 P.2d 168 (Utah 1981). In essence both of these cases preclude defense counsel from filing "wholly frivolous" appeals with certain restrictions to protect the client.

The Anders/Clayton procedures are not followed by defendant Griffin's counsel in this case. In light of the clear, unequivocal and recent case law on this subject provided by Taylor, Duren and Bankhead, cited in Point I above it is simply not conceivable that defendant's counsel can be filing this brief in good faith as required by Rule 11, Utah Rules of Civil Procedure.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, the City is entitled to sanctions, in an amount to be determined by the Court, against defendant's counsel personally for the time and expense involved in responding to defendant's brief.


---

<sup>3</sup> Defendant Griffin's brief also fails to comply with Rule 24 of the Rules of the Utah Court of Appeals as noted in footnote 1, supra.

CONCLUSION

Defendant Griffin's appeal is directly contrary to recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court and the Supreme Court of the State of Utah and must be dismissed. Further, the brief is in such bad faith that defendant's counsel should be personally sanctioned pursuant to Rule 11, Utah Rules of Civil Procedure.

DATED this 24<sup>th</sup> day of November, 1987.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
BRUCE R. BAIRD  
Assistant City Attorney  
Attorney for Respondent

BRB:cc